

Remarks

Attached is an amendment to my Specification, which should be used as a substitute to my current Specification as it incorporates extended amendments. It includes the corrections to the problems cited in the Office Action Summary dated December 21, 2004. It also includes the amendment corrections listed in the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated 04/26/05. As such I have included a clean version of the amendment and a marked up version, which shows the changes made relative to the immediate prior version.

The following Specification sections have been amended:

- Brief Description of Drawings
- Detailed Description

The following amendments have been made to the claims:

- Claim 1 (currently amended)
- Claim 2 (currently amended)
- Claim 3 (currently amended)
- Claim 4 (original)

Response to Office Action Summary dated December 21, 2004

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

References cited on form PTO-892 by the examiner, therefore, they've been considered. No new changes have been made.

DRAWINGS

No Amendments made to the drawings.

Reference characters now included as part of the amended Detailed Description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b). See attached amendment of Specification.

SPECIFICATION

Brief Description Of Drawings

The Brief Description has been edited to be brief. First sentence of prior submission kept. The rest incorporated as part of the Detailed Description. See attached amendment of Specification.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS**Response to Claim Objections:**

1 - Claims can only be one sentence long.

The "note" parts of claims 2 and 3 were improper and have been removed. See attached amendment of Specification.

2 - Claim 1 amended to address the following:

Limitation: "the entire front surface" in line 6, insufficient antecedent

Limitation: "the thumb and finger stalls of the glove" in lines 7-8, insufficient antecedent

Limitation: "the sides of the palm" in line 10, insufficient antecedent

Limitation: "the tips of all the said stalls" in line 12, insufficient antecedent

Limitation: "the sides of all the said stalls" in line 14, insufficient antecedent

See attached amendment of Specification for corrections.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC 102**Response to Claim Rejections:**

Claims 1- 3 rejected as being anticipated by Perez in 5720048

Claims 1- 3 rejected as being anticipated by Carr in 5765252

Claims 1- 3 rejected as being anticipated by Borucki-Mastej in 6000060

Claims 1- 3 rejected as being anticipated by Guzman in 6016571

Patent # 5720048, Patent # 5765252, Patent # 6000060, and Patent # 6016571 are different from my invention and are not anticipated. The "Arguments I" section below details how my invention is different from the mentioned patents and explains how these differences represent limitations for Patent # 5720048, Patent # 5765252, Patent # 6000060, and Patent # 6016571.

ARGUMENTS I

Mentioned patents fall short from my invention:

Patent # 5720048, Patent # 5765252, Patent # 6000060, and Patent # 6016571 which were cited as reasons for rejections of claims 1-3 of my invention, are all similar to each other and somewhat to my invention in that they consist of a waterproof glove which has some type of cleaning material, bristles in particular, on its surface. However, in their current form, they are different and all fall short of my invention in that they do not meet my needs. They all have limitations, which do not allow these patents to effectively nor efficiently meet the intended uses or purposes of my invention.

A major difference between the above patents and my invention is the type of coverage, location of coverage and the types of cleaning actions, which can be performed with my

invention and cannot be performed with Patent # 5720048, Patent # 5765252, Patent # 6000060, and Patent # 6016571.

A key component of my invention is that a user will be able to reach and clean any area or surface which any part of a human hand (front surface, fingers, fingertips, sides of fingers and side of palm) can reach while taking advantage of all the natural movements of a hand, thus increasing the efficiency of the cleaning action. This cannot be achieved by the inventions mentioned in Patent # 5720048, Patent # 5765252, Patent # 6000060, and Patent 6016571 due to their limitations, which are highlighted below.

Instead of having a uniform coverage of bristles along the surface of the glove, my invention has various types of coverage, which takes into consideration the natural shape, and functionality of the hand, as well as the intended surface to be cleaned.

Limitations of Patent # 5720048:

Patent # 5720048 is different from my invention in that:

- It does not have Bristle Coverage along the tips of the finger stalls
- It does not have Bristle Coverage along the sides of the finger stalls.

These are all important limitations, which are detailed in the sections below.

Limitations of Patent # 5765252:

Patent # 5765252 is different from my invention in that:

- It only has Partial Palm Coverage of Bristles
- It does not have Bristle Coverage along the sides of the palm
- It does not have Bristle Coverage along the sides of the finger stalls

These are all important limitations, which are detailed in the sections below.

Limitations of Patent # 6000060:

Patent # 6000060 is different from my invention in that:

- It does not have Bristle Coverage along the tips of the finger stalls
- It does not have Bristle Coverage along the sides of the palm
- It does not have Bristle Coverage along the sides of the finger stalls

These are all important limitations, which are detailed in the sections below.

Limitations of Patent # 6016571:

Patent # 6016571 is different from my invention in that:

Only tips of fingers have bristles that extend 180 degrees around the tips as stated in claim 3, and only the side section of glove has bristle coverage which wraps 90 degree around the side which corresponds to the palm as stated in claim 4.

- It only has Partial Palm Coverage of Bristles
- It does not have Bristle Coverage along the sides of the finger stalls.

These are all important limitations, which are detailed in the sections below.

Detailed explanation of how the above limitations fall short of my invention and limit the effectiveness of the cleaning action

- Only Partial Palm Coverage of Bristles

Falls short from my invention in that this partial palm coverage limits the effectiveness of the cleaning action, as I believe it is possible to achieve optimum cleaning with greater ease when a cleaning supply mimics the natural movements and shape of the body part, namely the hand. Partial coverage of bristles on the palm also seems unnatural has the entire surface of the hand cannot be used when applying pressure to clean a surface. My invention is more effective as it uses the entire surface of the palm when performing a cleaning action. It is also easier to apply greater force when using the lower portion of the palm than it is when using the upper portion. Just as you would achieve maximum results with using the entire surface of a hand to clean a surface instead of just a partial surface, same thing holds true when bristles cover the entire surface of the glove which my invention does.

- No Bristle Coverage along the sides of the palm

This falls short of my invention, which has bristles along the sides of the palm. The absence of bristles along the sides of the palm limits the effectiveness and types of cleaning actions that can be performed. Having bristles along the sides of the palm allows and improves the cleaning of lines between tiles on a bathroom wall or areas of the kitchen for example

- No Bristle Coverage along the sides of the finger stalls

This falls short of my invention, which has bristles along the sides of all finger stalls. This improves the effectiveness of the cleaning action and increases the types of cleaning actions, as there are more surfaces of the glove which have various shapes and which can access many more cleaning surfaces. For example, one can achieve more effective and quicker cleaning results of a the surfaces between a pole and sides of a tub by placing their hand around the pole and close to the connecting surface, and making a circle by joining the tips of the thumb and index fingers, then moving their the formed circle in a somewhat circular motion. This will allow for the bristles located along the sides of thumb and index finger stalls to easily and effectively clean that otherwise hard to clean surface.

Another example of how having bristles along the sides of all finger stalls will improve and increase the types of cleaning actions is with the contour of a faucet Nose. The nose in certain conditions can develop mold or other dirty agents along its contour. With my invention, the user could form a circle by joining the tips of the thumb and index fingers in a circular shape, the tightening it around the faucet not so that the bristles along the sides of the thumb and index finger stalls are against the contour and scrub it when moving them in circular motions. Having bristles along the sides of the finger stalls will also allow and facilitate the cleaning of surfaces that have more than one dimension.

- No Bristle Coverage along the tips of the finger stalls

Falls short from my invention in that it is unable of using the natural scratching motion one can use with fingernails in a cleaning action as there are no bristles along the tips of the finger stalls. On the contrary, my invention improves the ease of cleaning and is intended to mimic the fingernail or action that would come

naturally with using the fingernail. Just as you would use your finger and finger nails to scratch and clean hard to reach spaces, in the same way are the bristles, which are located at the end of the finger stalls intended to facilitate, improve and permit cleaning of hard to reach spots, in a scratching motion, without getting ones fingernails dirty.

CONCLUSION

The limitations of Patent # 5720048, Patent # 5765252, Patent # 6000060, and Patent # 6016571 mentioned above are all limitations that the previous inventions have and which make my invention not only different, but also more effective as a cleaning device as it increases the types of cleaning action and the effectiveness with which they are accomplished. Claims 1-3 of my invention are; therefore, not anticipated by Perez in Patent # 5720048, by Carr in Patent # 5765252, by Borucki-Mastej in Patent # 6000060 nor by Guzman in Patent # 6016571.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC 103

Response to Claim Rejections:

Claim 4 rejected as being unpatentable over Perez in 5720048

Claim 4 rejected as being unpatentable over Carr in 5765252

Claim 4 rejected as being unpatentable over Borucki-Mastej in 6000060

Claim 4 rejected as being unpatentable over Guzman in 6016571

The "Arguments II" section below details how claim 4 of my invention is not obvious and should; therefore, be patentable over Patent # 5720048, Patent # 5765252, Patent # 6000060, and Patent # 6016571.

ARGUMENTS II

Because Patent # 5720048, Patent # 5765252, Patent # 6000060, and Patent # 6016571 have many limitations which make them different from my invention as detailed under the ARGUMENTS I section above, I believe it no longer makes claim 4 of my invention obvious as claims 1-3 are different and unique to my invention, thus making claim 4 significant in that it helps solve a stated problem, problems that are stated in the ARGUMENTS I section.

Claim 4 of my invention specifies the length of the bristles on my invention. The length of the bristles on their own may seem obvious; however, they do not constitute nor accurately define my invention as a standalone. Claim 4 is meant to exist with claims 1-3 of my invention. The combination makes my invention unique and thus patentable. Claim 4 in combination with claims 1-3 of my invention does not make claim 4 of my invention obvious to a person of ordinary skill as it is dependent on claims 1-3 of my invention which are unique.

CONCLUSION

The prior art described in Patent # 5720048, Patent # 5765252, Patent # 6000060, and Patent # 6016571 is different from my invention and presents numerous limitations

which my invention addresses. Because they do not solve the problems nor provide a solution to the problems and limitations discussed in my application and which my invention addresses and provides solutions to, they are not anticipated thus making claims 1-3 of my invention patentable, nor can they be considered obvious thus making claim 4 of my invention patentable.